

transmission portion, at said server, transmitting the folder structure to said client by mail in response to the inquiry mail sent from said client.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the PTO maintains its position that *Iwasaki* teaches Applicant's claim features. The PTO hinges this argument on the alleged teaching of *Iwasaki* in which a personal computer sends an email for registering a document in a database to documentation-management equipment. The email contains various parts including a file folder where the document will arguably be stored. The management equipment processes the email and sends a registration result to the client computer. See Figs. 1 and 2.

The PTO fails to appreciate, however, that even if the email transmission of the personal computer can reasonably be considered a request, there is no teaching or suggestion that the management equipment transmits a folder structure to the personal computer in response to this request. In fact, *Iwasaki* discloses a concept in which the personal computer sends a folder structure and attached file to the management equipment (Fig. 2; pgphs 15-16). Thus, there appears to be no need for the management equipment to resend this folder structure to the personal computer so that the personal computer can then send an attached file to the management computer, as recited in Applicant's claims.

Iwasaki discloses that the initial email transmission dictates whether a file will be registered, retrieved, or searched (see pgphs 21-22). There is no indication that the personal computer sends a document to be registered to the management equipment in a subsequent email after the personal computer receives a registration result from the management computer. Rather, a more reasonable and prudent interpretation of *Iwasaki*, provides for the personal computer sending the document

to be registered in the initial email (see pgph 25). In this regard, *Iwasaki* teaches away from Applicant's claimed combination of features.

In sum, Applicant respectfully submits that the techniques and concepts disclosed in *Iwasaki* fail to anticipate Applicant's claims, because the transactions performed between personal computer and management computer are not analogous to the combination of features recited in Applicant's claims. For at least these reasons, claims 1, 10, and 17 and their corresponding depending claims are novel over the applied art. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-9, 11-14, 16, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Iwasaki* in view of *Mutton et al* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0147840). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the presentation of further documentation to support the previous rejection under Official Notice. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the additional evidence still does not remedy the deficiencies of *Iwasaki* and *Mutton* with respect to the combination of features recited in Applicant's independent claims. As a result, the above-noted dependent claims are further distinguishable over the applied art of record such that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion


Based on at least the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-20 are allowable, and this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a favorable examination and consideration of the instant application. In the event the instant application can be placed in even better form, Applicant requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 9, 2008

By:


Tremesha S. Willis
Registration No. 61830

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620